

REMARKS35 USC 112

Applicant respectfully traverses all of the Examiner's rejections. Nevertheless, to facilitate allowance, Applicant amended claims 1, 9 for further clarity, and reintroduces the term --"resistivity"-- in lieu of "resistance." Applicant cancelled dependent claims 14, 15 as redundant (Examiner's comments 1, 2).

35 USC 103

To the extent any art rejection continues to be applied against claims 1, 9, as amended, and claims 2-6, 8-13, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes neither Lin, Zhao, Wen, Johnson nor Ito, whether applied either singly or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests Applicant's device or inductor as claimed in claim 1 or 9, as amended. None of the art cited even suggests second conductor area dimensions of 150 microns x 150 microns, coupling coefficient of at least 0.9, and an approx. 1.78 nh inductance, in combination with the remaining elements of Applicant's claimed invention.

Applicant believes any art rejection is overcome, without the introduction of new matter. See, for example, pages 5-6 for subject matter support in the application as filed.

Entry of the Amendment and passage of this application to issue are respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney appreciates the Examiner's continued courtesy and consideration with respect to the instant Application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Richard P. Volant, et al.

By: 

Joseph P. Abate

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 30,238

Telephone No. 845-894-4633

10-24-05